REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated August 6, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is included. Claims 15-22 and 24-28 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 15, 20, 24 and 26-28 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claim 20 recites the phrase "configured to," which is optional language that raises the question of "what patentable weight should be given to such language?" The Applicants have amended the claim to remove the phrase "configured to." The phrase "configured to" has now been replaced with more active language. Accordingly, reconsideration of the scope of the claim is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 24 is objected to because of minor informalities. Specifically, claim 24 presently depends from claim 23, which has been canceled. The Applicants have amended claim 24 to now depend from independent claim 15. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 24 is respectfully requested.

In Office Action, claims 15-17, 24-26 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Shikakura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6, 108,379, hereafter "Shikakura"); and claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shikakura. The Applicants have amended independent claims 15 and 26-28 to help further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Independent claim 15 (as amended) recites the following features:

"[a] broadcast receiving apparatus comprising:

a receiver which receives a first TV broadcast signal and a second TV broadcast signal, each of the first TV broadcast signal and the second TV broadcast signal including video data for reproducing an image, wherein an image to be reproduced from the first TV broadcast signal is of higher quality than an image to be reproduced from the second TV broadcast signal;

a first decoder which decodes the first TV broadcast signal received by said receiver;

a second decoder which decodes the second TV broadcast signal received by said receiver;

a detector which detects a decoding error part of the first TV broadcast signal decoded by said first decoder; and

a synthesizer which generates a composite signal obtained by replacing the decoding error part of the first TV broadcast signal detected by the detector with a corresponding part of the second TV broadcast signal decoded by said second decoder,

wherein the first TV broadcast signal and the second TV broadcast signal are each a digital TV broadcast signal, and the first TV broadcast signal has a content identical to a content of the second TV broadcast signal and provides video data of a quality higher than a quality of the second TV broadcast signal." (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 15 are similarly recited in independent claims 26-28 (as amended). Additionally, the features emphasized above in independent claim 15 (and similarly recited in independent claims 26-28) are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., pg 9).

As amended, independent claims 15 and 26-28 are distinguishable from the cited prior art in that a first decoder (or first decoding step) decodes a first TV broadcast signal received by a receiver, and each of the first TV broadcast signal and the second TV broadcast signal include video data for reproducing an image. Additionally, an image to be reproduced from the first TV broadcast signal is of higher quality than an image to be reproduced from the second TV broadcast signal. That is, the first TV broadcast signal includes high quality video data for reproducing a high quality image.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the previous claim language of independent claims 15 and 26-28 does not require that "an image signal is obtained from the first TV broadcast signal or from the second TV broadcast signal originally" (see pg. 3 of Office Action). Therefore, the Examiner relied on Shikakura for disclosing or suggesting the features recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28.

As noted above, the Applicants have amended independent claims 15 and 26-28 to point

out that an image is obtained from the first TV broadcast signal and the second TV broadcast signal, and the image to be reproduced from the first TV broadcast signal is of higher quality than an image to be reproduced from the second TV broadcast signal. Accordingly, the Applicants assert that Shikakura fails to disclose or suggest the features now recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28 (as amended).

In particular, Shikakura fails to disclose or suggest a first decoder that decodes a first TV broadcast signal received by a receiver, wherein the first TV broadcast signal includes high quality video data for reproducing a high quality image; and wherein the first TV broadcast signal has a content identical to a content of a second TV broadcast signal, and provides video data of a quality higher than a quality of the second TV broadcast signal for reproducing the higher quality image (as recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28, as amended).

Conversely, Shikakura discloses a transmission line decoder (2) 204 and an information source decoder (2) 206 that are each adapted to decode a residual bit stream to provide a residual image signal (see col. 8, lines 33-44). The residual image signal and a low-quality image signal (low-frequency components of an image signal) are then synthesized to provide the original image signal (high-quality image signal).

That is, in Shikakura, signals to be decoded are:1) a low-quality bit stream (obtained by compressing an original image signal); and 2) a residual bit stream (compressed signal obtained by extracting from the original image signal, lower-quality video signals (decoded low-quality bit stream)). The residual video signal obtained by decoding the residual bit stream is then synthesized with the low-quality image signal to reproduce the original image signal (high-quality image signal). However, in Shikakura, an image signal cannot be obtained from the residual bit stream or the residual image signal.

On the other and, in the present invention (as recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28) signals to be decoded are TV broadcast signals, and from each TV broadcast signal alone, an original image can be reproduced. Therefore, it is apparent that the residual bit stream or the residual image signal disclosed in Shikakura is not the TV broadcast signals of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28).

Additionally, the band synthesis unit 215 disclosed in Shikakura is adapted to synthesize the low-quality image signal (low-frequency components of the image signal) and the residual image signal (high-frequency components of the image signal) (see col. 8, lines 44-51). The low-quality image signal and the residual image signal exist even after the synthesis. Therefore, it is not possible for the residual image signal to be replaced with the low-quality image signal, as recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28.

Moreover, Shikakura discloses a bit error position detection circuit (212) which detects a bit error position in the residual bit stream, and provides control such that the residual video signal is not synthesized with the low quality image signal upon detecting a bit error (see col. 9, lines 8-13). In Shikakura, the signal subjected to the decoding error detection is the residual bit stream which is the compressed signal obtained by extracting from the original signal, a low-quality video signal (decoded low-quality bit stream). Thus, the circuit disclosed in Shikakura does not even receive a signal corresponding to the first TV broadcast signal of the present invention (i.e., the high quality image signal).

Based on the above discussion, Shikakura fails to anticipate or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 15 and 26-28 (as amended). Likewise, Shikakura fails to anticipate or render obvious the features recited in claims 16, 17, 24 and 25 at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 15.

In the Office Action, claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shikakura in view of Hatabu et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0117643, hereafter "Hatabu"); and claims 19-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shikakura in view of Karaoguz et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0066089, hereafter "Karaoguz").

Claims 18-22 depend from independent claim 15. As noted above, Shikakura fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 15 (as amended). Additionally, Hatabu and Karaoguz fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Shikakura. Thus, no combination of Shikakura with Hatabu or Karaoguz would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 18-22 at least by virtue of their dependencies from

independent claim 15.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsuyoshi ISOMURA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/
2009.11.06 13:04:12 -05'00'

By: _____
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 6, 2009